

REMARKS

Each of claims 1-8, 10-12, 15-17, 19, and 20 remains pending and at issue in this application, with claims 1, 15, and 17 being independent claims. With this Response, Applicants amend each of claims 1, 12, 15, and 17, and add new claims 21- 24. Each of the amendments and new claims finds support in the application as originally filed and, accordingly, neither the amendments nor the new claims adds new matter. In view of the amendments above and the remarks below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Each of claims 1-8, 10-12, 15-17, 19, and 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0028610 of Pearson in view of one or more of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0050976 of Block et al. (hereinafter "Block"); and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0243672 of Markki et al. (hereinafter "Markki").

Independent Claim 1

As amended, independent claim 1 is directed to a computer storage medium comprising computer executable code for creating a graphical user interface presented on a display in communication with a processor associated with a group interaction application for facilitating file sharing among a first member of a group and at least one other member of the group over a network and recites, in part, computer executable code for displaying a selectable indicator for visually presenting a group member list to the first user, the group member list including an indication field of a role for each of the members in the list wherein the list of group members also includes an indication reflecting for each group member whether the group member is currently online; an indication of new content, wherein new content comprises files added or changed within a predetermined period of time; and a third control allowing selection of the predetermined period of time.

Neither Pearson nor Block, individually or in any obvious combination, can render amended claim 1 obvious, because neither Pearson nor Block, considered alone or in an obvious combination, discloses or suggests (1) presenting a group

member list to a first user, the group member list including an indication reflecting for each group member ***whether the group member is currently online***; (2) an ***indication of new content***, wherein new content comprises files ***added or changed within a predetermined period of time***; and (3) ***a third control allowing selection of the predetermined period of time***.

In the Office action, the Office alleges that Block discloses presenting a group member list to a user, the group member list including an indication reflecting connection information for each group member. (See Office action at page 4.) The Office action alleges that a person of ordinary skill in the art, considering this disclosure and the disclosure of Pearson, would find the combination of elements recited by claim 1 obvious. (See Office action at page 5.) Block is directed to a structure for accessing and populating community websites. Whether considered separately or with Pearson, Block does not appear to disclose or suggest displaying a member list that includes an indication reflecting for each group member ***whether the group member is currently online***.

Additionally, neither Pearson nor Block, considered separately or together, discloses or suggests displaying an indication of new content, wherein new content comprises files added or changed within a predetermined period of time, or displaying a third control allowing selection of the predetermined period of time, each of which is explicitly recited by amended claim 1.

For at least each of these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over any obvious combination of Pearson and Block, and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Dependent Claim 8

Dependent claim 8 is patentable over Pearson and Block, individually or considered in view of one another, because neither of Pearson nor Block, even considered in combination with the other, discloses or suggests all of the elements of claim 8. Specifically, neither Pearson nor Block, and no obvious combination of Pearson and Block, discloses or suggests each group member having access to a group space being assigned a unique identifier that is made available to the other group members. While the Office alleges that Pearson teaches the element recited

by claim 8 (see Office action at pages 6-7), Applicants respectfully submit that the Office is mistaken.

Contrary to statements in the Office action, Pearson does not disclose assigning a unique identifier to each group member, much less sharing the unique identifiers with other group members. In alleging that Pearson teaches this element, the Office relies, in particular, upon paragraph 0045 of Pearson. The relied-upon section of Pearson discloses assigning an identifier to each *file* available to be searched or shared. The identifiers assigned to each file are stored in a database or registry of sharing permissions for the files, so that copyrights may be appropriately protected. The relevant portion of paragraph 0045 states:

As shown in FIG. 7, through programming associated with a block 182, a user on a host computer chooses a file to share. A block 184 generates (usually prior to authentication of the file) **a unique alphanumerical identifier or message digest**, such as a digest derived according to the well-known MD5 message digest algorithm, **for use by the various host computers of the file-sharing system in identifying and distinguishing files to be searched and/or shared**. As described below, for large files, the generating of this message digest can be a time-consuming process, and means may be provided for providing a user with a periodic report on the progress of the calculation (e.g., with a graphical progress bar, for example) and the digest and other data is sent to a file-sharing administration server computer, which may be coupled to the wide-area network 42 (FIG. 1), as a request for permission to share a specified file. The file-sharing administration server computer maintains a database or registry of those files for which "permission to share" is required.

Pearson, even considered in view of Block, neither describes nor suggests assigning any identifier to a user, much less a unique identifier that is shared with other group members, as claim 8 recites. Accordingly, no combination of Pearson and Block can render claim 8 obvious, and Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Independent Claim 15 and New Claims 23 and 24

Inasmuch as the pending rejection of claim 1 is applied without modification to claim 15 (see Office action at page 8), Applicants respectfully submit that at least the first of the arguments presented above with respect to amended claim 1 also applies to amended claim 15. Specifically, Applicants submit that claim 15, as amended, is

patentable over Pearson and Block, individually or in any obvious combination, because neither Pearson nor Block, even considered together, discloses or suggests displaying a group member list wherein the list includes indicia reflecting for each group member ***whether the group member is currently connected to the network***. Thus, for at least this reason, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

New claim 23 depends from claim 15 and recites further comprising code for displaying an indication of new content, wherein new content comprises files added or changed within a predetermined period of time. New claim 24 depends from claim 23 and recites further comprising code for displaying a second control allowing selection of the predetermined period of time. Neither Pearson nor Block, considered separately or together, discloses or suggests displaying an indication of new content, wherein new content comprises files added or changed within a predetermined period of time, as recited by new claim 23, or displaying a third control allowing selection of the predetermined period of time, as recited by new claim 24.

Independent Claim 17

With this Response, independent claim 17 is amended to recite, in part, displaying a selectable indicator for visually presenting a group member list to the first user, the group member list including an indication field of a role for each of the members in the list wherein the list of group members includes indicia reflecting for each group member whether the group member is currently connected to the network.

Applicants respectfully submit that at least the first of the arguments presented above with respect to amended claim 1 also applies to amended claim 17. Specifically, Applicants submit that claim 17, as amended, is patentable over Pearson and Block, individually or in any obvious combination, because neither Pearson nor Block, even considered together, discloses or suggests displaying a group member list wherein the list includes indicia reflecting for each group member whether the group member is currently connected to the network. Thus, for at least this reason, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Additionally, however, Applicants respectfully submit that neither an obvious combination of Pearson and Block or one of Pearson and Block individually can render claim 17 obvious because Pearson and Block, even considered in view of one another, fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements recited by claim 17. In particular, no obvious combination of Pearson and Block discloses or suggests receiving from the computing device used by the at least one other user a response to the invitation request, the response including a **unique** numeric identifier associated with the at least one other user. Applicants agree with the Office that Pearson “fails to disclose...receiving a response to the invitation request by receipt of a unique numeric identifier associated with the at least one other user.” (See Office action at page 8.)

Block does not remedy the deficiencies of Pearson’s disclosure in proving a *prima facie* case of obviousness. The only mention in Block of any code number describes that a recipient of an invitation may use a code number to complete a registration process. (See Block at paragraph 0129.) Block does not disclose or even suggest that the described code number might be **unique** to the user and, in fact, discloses that the code number is associated **with an invitation** that “can be **broadcast** from” the described website and, therefore, would **not** be unique. (See Block at paragraph 0129.) Specifically, paragraph 0129 of Block states:

[0129] The My Friends list can also be used by the My Home Page Administrator to send out a new Invitation 712 to persons on the list. The Invitation might be in the form of: “see my page,” or “let’s share pages,” or “join myteam.com.” The Invitations are forwarded (or handled) through the message center 710. The email **Invitation can be broadcast from the myteam.com site**, with the myteam.com return email address. Alternatively, the email Invitation might be sent directly from the invitor, so the invitee can respond directly via email. The Invitation might be handled in the form of an email Invitation 714, or in the form of a paper Invitation 716. **The Invitation (with its associated code number)** can be used by the person receiving it to complete registration 718 with myteam.com, and subsequently gain access to the My Home page of the Administrator.

Thus, because Pearson and Block, individually or considered together, would not lead a person of ordinary skill in the art to make the combination of elements recited by claim 17, no combination of Pearson and Block can render claim 17 obvious.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

New Claims 21 and 22

With this Response, Applicants add new claims 21 and 22, each of which depends from claim 17. In addition to being patentable over both Pearson and Block, considered independently or in combination, because each depends from a patentable independent claim, each of dependent claims 21 and 22 is patentable because each recites an element that is neither disclosed nor suggested by any obvious combination of Pearson and Block (or by either Pearson or Block individually).

In addition to the elements of claim 17, claim 21 recites receiving an input selecting between (a) a first mode in which files in the group space are copied to the computing device used by the at least one other user on an on-demand basis and (b) a second mode in which files in the shared space are replicated to the computer device used by the at least one other user when the files are added to the group space.

Neither Pearson nor Block, considered independently or in combination, discloses or suggests receiving an input selecting between two modes as recited by claim 21. At best, Pearson can be read to describe a system in which a user can select particular files for download. (See Pearson at paragraph 0051.) Similarly, Block can at best be read as describing a system in which users can select web pages and other information to view. But Block does not disclose or suggest any ***selection between two modes***, much less selection between two modes including a mode in which shared files are replicated to the computer device used by the at least one other user ***when the files are added to the group space***, as recited by claim 21.

Similarly, neither Pearson nor Block, considered independently or in combination, discloses or suggests displaying an indication of a file added to a group space, the indication displayed with a new content indicator if the file was added or modified within a predetermined period of time, as recited by claim 22. At best, Pearson can be read to describe a system in which, for a given file, a list of available host computers is regularly updated. (See Pearson at paragraph 0036.) Updating a

list of computers currently hosting a particular file is not the same as displaying new content in a shared space and displaying a time-dependent indicator that the file has been added or modified, as generally required by claim 22.

Applicants submit that no feature described in Block can fairly be said to disclose or suggest the element recited by claim 22, even considering Block together with Pearson.

For at least these reasons Applicants respectfully request favorable action with respect to new claims 21 and 22.

Claims 2-7, 10-12, 16, 19, and 20

Each of claims 2-7, 10-12, 16, 19, and 20 depends, directly or indirectly, from one of independent claims 1, 15, and 17, each asserted to be patentable for the reasons described above. Accordingly, Applicants submit that each of claims 2-7, 10-12, 16, 19, and 20 is patentable at least because it depends from a patentable claim. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.


CONCLUSION

Accordingly, all remaining claims are in condition for allowance for the reasons provided above. Applicants file this response with a petition, and the requisite fee, for a one-month extension of time, thereby extending the deadline for response to December 16, 2010. Although Applicants believe that no additional fees or petitions are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 13-2855 of Marshall, Gerstein & Borun, LLP under Order No. 30835/306083. Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the foregoing comments or any claim amendments deemed needed to result in allowance, Applicants kindly request the Examiner to contact the undersigned by telephone at the number given below.

December 16, 2010

Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond, WA 98052-6399
Direct telephone: (425) 707-9382

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Jeremy D. Protas
Registration No.: 61,681